

REMARKS

**Status of Claims.** After entering the above amendments, claims 1-20 will be pending, with claims 1, 8, and 12 being independent. Claims 1, 8, and 12 have been amended to clarify the operation of the recited subject matter. New claims 19 and 20, which depend from claim 1, have been added. These claim amendments and new claims are fully supported by the original specification, at least at paragraphs [0021] and [0022]. No new matter has been added.

Reconsideration and allowance of the current application are requested.

Claims 1-18 have been rejected for allegedly being anticipated by Stewart et al. (U.S. 2002/0161688, “Stewart”)

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-18 stand rejected for allegedly being anticipated by Stewart. These rejections are traversed. For a valid rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the Office must cite a reference that discloses each and every element of the instantly claimed subject matter with the same level of detail as is recited in the rejected claim. Stewart fails to provide such a valid basis for rejection of the currently submitted claims.

Stewart discloses an enterprise-wide electronic commerce system that is based on a central hub architecture. Participant trading partners communicate with one another by joining conversations hosted in a collaboration space and managed by a collaboration hub. Trading partners use collaboration enablers, or c-enablers 158, software applications allowing them to send messages to, and receive messages from, the c-hub (see e.g. ¶[0085]). The provided architecture allows each trading partner to handle the implementation of their own business process and rules locally, while conforming to the rules of engagement (defined by the global information and business protocols) for a given c-space (see e.g. ¶[0141]).

As noted above, claims 1, 8, and 12 have been amended to add descriptions of additional components or method steps that were implied in the originally submitted claims. New claims 19 and 20 add additional limitations regarding the integration server which are also not disclosed by Stewart. For example, it is respectfully submitted that Stewart fails to disclose or suggest at least a pre-loaded integration repository, system landscape directory, and integration directory that work together with an integration server or persistence layer as recited in claims 1, 8, and 12.

It is respectfully submitted that in light of these amendments, the claims as currently presented are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the disclosure of Stewart. Favorable action is therefore requested.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the foregoing amendments, the pending claims are in condition for allowance. It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper.

If there are any questions regarding these amendments and remarks, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. No fees are believed to be due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees that may be due, or credit any overpayment of same, to Deposit Account No. 50-0311, Reference No. 34874-061/2003P00050US01.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 9, 2007

/MDV/

Michael Van Loy  
Reg. No. 52,315

Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris, Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.  
9255 Towne Centre Drive, Suite 600  
San Diego, CA 92121  
**Customer No. 64280**  
Tel.: 858/320-3059  
Fax: 858/320-3001